DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 730 FL 018 174

TITLE Literature Review: Research Findings on Students' Use of Hawaii Creole (Pidgin) English and Relationships with Standard English and School Achievement in Hawaii. Revised.

INSTITUTION Hawaii State Dept. of Education, Honolulu. Office of the Superintendent.

PUB DATE Mar 88

NOTE 40p.

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Creoles; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Indigenous Populations; Instructional Materials; *Language Patterns; Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Language Role; *Pidgins; Reading Achievement; Reading Comprehension; Second Language Learning; Speech Communication; *Standard Spoken Usage; Uncommonly Taught Languages

IDENTIFIERS *Hawaii Pidgin

ABSTRACT

A review of literature relating to the use of Hawaiian pidgin and standard English and their relationship to school achievement was undertaken in response to concerns regarding state educational policy for language use and proficiency. The research reviewed includes pidgin and creole studies, second language acquisition research, and studies of prior language intervention programs in Hawaii. Relevant Hawaii-specific research focuses primarily on elementary school children's reading and oral language development. The findings in school language learning include research on reading achievement and related measures, oral story comprehension, and standard English and Hawaiian creole relationships. Materials on classroom instruction are also reviewed. A two-page reference list is provided, and appended materials include a statement of the board of education's policy on standard English and oral communication, and acknowledgements. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311730

Literature Review: Research Findings on Students' Use of Hawaii Creole (Pidgin) English and Relationships with Standard English and School Achievement in Hawaii

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Takata

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Department of Education
Office of the Superintendent
Planning and Evaluation Branch
Evaluation Section

March 1988 (revised)

FL018174

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Background: Policy Context	1
Background: Context of the Current Study	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Search Procedures and Criteria	4
Limitations	6
Related Research	6
Pidgin/Creole Studies	6
Second Language Acquisition Research	8
Prior Interventions in Hawaii	9
LITERATURE REVIEW FINDINGS	11
School Language Learning	11
1. Reading Achievement (and Related Measures)	11
2. Oral Story Comprehension	14
3. Standard English and HCE Relationships	16
Classroom Instruction	19
CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	26
REFERENCES	31
REFERENCE NOTES	34
Appendix A	
Policy: Standard English and Oral Communication	35
Appendix B	
Acknowledgements	36

Background: Policy Context

During the month of September 1987, eight articles concerning the use of "pidgin English" in the public schools appeared on the front pages of Hawaii's two major daily newspapers. The Honolulu Advertiser story, "Panel wants pidgin kept out of schools" (Reyes, September 2, 1987), reported that a Board of Education (BOE) Curriculum Committee meeting held September 1, 1987 was marked by "sometimes heated debate about the merits of pidgin English. . . [but] approved guidelines to ensure pidgin is kept out of the classroom and standard English is used to teach students in Hawaii's public schools" (p. A-1). That same Curriculum Committee meeting also resulted in a motion (BOE, Note 1) to send to the full Board of Education a proposed draft letter for the Superintendent containing the Board's directives for oral communication.

The proposed draft letter, which later in the month was to become the basis for an official policy on standard English and oral communication, is noteworthy in that the several perspectives and concerns discussed by members of the Curriculum Committee were summarized in the form of supporting rationale statements. Key among these statements were the following (BOE, Attachment 1 [draft letter], Note 1):

> Oral communication is the most commonly used form of communication in human interaction in personal or social situations and in the workplace. Oral communication, specifically oral English, may, therefore, be considered the most significant and useful form of communication throughout a lifetime.
>
> We must ... offer ... [students] full opportunity to develop facility in oral English as a life skill directly affecting a person's self-esteem and achievement level, standard of living and ultimately, quality of life.

At its September 17, 1987 meeting, the Board of Education approved a policy titled "Standard English and Oral Communication." A Department of Education (DOE) news release on September 18 quoted Superintendent Charles Toguchi as saying: "The intent of the policy is not to demean pidgin or its use as a means of communication, nor is it an attempt to ban the island creole language or replace it entirely. . . What the policy does is reaffirm long-standing BOE-DOE objectives of the language arts program to promote and develop

effective communication. The policy clarifies and reminds educators and students of the importance of what is termed standard English throughout the instructional curriculum" (DOE, Note 2). (See Appendix A for a copy of the "Standard English and Oral Communication " policy.)

The BOE's action was covered in The Honolulu Advertiser on September 18 in a front page article, "Board votes 7-4 to keep pidgin out of the classroom" (Reyes, September 18, 1987). The story focused largely on the "heated debate and testimony from some in the community who defended pidgin as 'a valuable, effective teaching strategy' in the classroom and as a form of Hawaiian creole" (p. A-1). Most important to note, however, is that persons testifying against the policy did not generally seem to be opposed to the intended purpose of the policy (i.e., setting high basic skills priority on developing students' facility in oral standard English). Rather, the main bases for contention appeared to involve dual concerns: (1) how to best operationalize implementation of the policy in the classroom, and (2) the potential harm that could result to students from a narrow "standard English only" interpretation of the policy.

Media coverage culminated with a four-part Advertiser series, "Talking 'Da Kind,' The Pidgin Story," which appeared from September 27-30, 1987. One of the news articles in that series, "Strong English skills open many doors" (Oshiro, September 29, 1987) reported information directly relevant to part of the underlying rationale for the BOE policy. Interviews with business representatives appear to confirm the common belief that "applicants who speak only pidgin tend to be excluded from top managerial posts that require strong English communications skills" (p. A-1). Business representatives were quoted as saying that jobs which involve extensive contact with the public, drafting or editing of correspondence, communication with people on the mainland or that require employees to "project a 'professional' corporate image" (p. A-1) require applicants to have well-developed English skills.

Also reported in that same article (Oshiro, September 29, 1987) was a recent federal court ruling which found that an employer may deny an applicant a job or a worker a promotion based on lack of proficiency in English oral communication skills needed for the job. In a case involving the National

Weather Service, the court found that "no racial discrimination was involved when an employer makes a decision based on the ability to communicate clearly with the public" (p. A-4).

Background: Context of the Current Study

The DOE's Evaluation Section, Planning and Evaluation Branch, Office of the Superintendent, was asked in mid-August 1987 to examine the feasibility of a study to determine the extent to which students and teachers use "pidgin English" in the classroom. Such information would have been useful to the BOE's Curriculum Committee which, at that point in time, had begun to discuss "pidgin English" as a potential policy issue. Initially, we framed the problem as one of estimating the prevalence of "pidgin English" use by students and teachers in the classroom.

It quickly became evident that our apparently simple problem statement was anything but simple in solution. In brief, we were to conclude that a prevalence-estimation study would not be feasible, certainly not within a time frame that would be relevant to informing discussion within the BOE's Curriculum Committee. One problem, for example, is that there exists no standard, unambiguous set of agreed-upon features or markers of "pidgin English." A related problem is the lack of oral language instruments or observational/recording procedures appropriate to a large-scale assessment of "pidgin English" use among children or adults. Moreover, we were also to conclude that a prevalence-estimation study per se, without other related information, might be worthless. At issue here was the concern that prevalence estimates per se, without related information about the circumstances under which "pidgin English" use occurred, might be largely meaningless and even misleading.

What sort of study, then, might be feasible yet useful? As indicated earlier, the "Standard English and Oral Communication" policy approved by the BOE essentially underscored, as a high basic skills priority, the development of students' facility in oral standard English. The policy stated, in part, that school staff will "model the use of standard English in the classroom and

school-related settings. . . [and] encourage students to use and practice oral standard English" (see Appendix A). The policy statement made no mention of "pidgin English." If, however, the policy were interpreted as barring students' and teachers' use of "pidgin English" in the classroom, an interpretation which clearly was the focus of numerous newspaper reports, then what might be the impact on students? There exists an array of research, including parts of the research literature on first and second language acquisition, literacy development, sociolinguistics, language learning (psychology), pidgin/creole studies, contemporary cultural anthropology or ethnography, and educational research, relevant to that question. A literature review, then, seemed appropriate as a feasible form of study that could serve to summarize relevant research knowledge.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The question used to define the scope of the present review was: What does research tell us about relationships between students' use of "pidgin English," standard English, and school achievement in Hawaii? In terms of areas of school achievement, as will be seen below, the relevant Hawaii-specific research has focused mostly on early elementary students' reading and oral language development.

The scope of the present review, then, does not include looking at purported limitations of "pidgin English" speakers' standard English facility on their secondary or post-secondary educational, employment, or social opportunities. Although occasional news articles and much personal opinion are available, no research was found to either confirm or disconfirm the validity of such language-related "quality of life" beliefs.

Search Procedures and Criteria

Two search procedures were used. First, researchers at the University of Hawaii at Manoa and at the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate's Center for Development of Early Education were contacted. Initial contacts served the purposes of obtaining (a) copies of papers and reports, particularly

unpublished research not readily accessible elsewhere, (b) references to other potentially relevant research, and (c) referrals to other researchers. This procedure was repeated iteratively over a period of about one month until it seemed, judging from the amount of duplication that began to occur, that most active researchers with relevant information had been contacted. In addition, a similar procedure was initiated with selected Department of Education specialists as resource persons.

In Appendix B we gratefully acknowledge the persons who contributed information to the literature review process. No endorsement on their part of the present work, of course, is to be implied.

Second, two searches of the journal and document collections of ERIC were conducted through the Hawaii Educational Dissemination Diffusion System (HEDDS). Results from the first search were used to modify keywords for the second search. Interestingly, and perhaps a testimonial to the working knowledge of Hawaii's researchers, the ERIC searches produced only a few additional relevant references.

The criteria used to select research literature during the search process were: (1) content involving standard English and/or non-standard English language/speech (non-standard English, "pidgin" or Hawaiian Creole English) among school-age children in Hawaii, and (2) content focused on relationships between standard English and/or non-standard English speech and school achievement. School achievement was broadly viewed as comprising "outcomes" in the cognitive and affective domains.

The set of documents selected was very diverse, consisting of published and unpublished papers and reports, including studies based on descriptive and experimental designs, and representing a wide array of research disciplines. Many of the studies involved cross-disciplinary research. No prior literature review of the particular topic of interest here, unfortunately, was found. Two studies, though, Gallimore and Tharp (1976) and Speidel (1981), provided partial summaries of relevant research which were quite helpful.

Limitations

No claim is made that a comprehensive search of all potentially relevant research was conducted. We did not, for example, conduct a search of Dissertation Abstracts International. Time and other work commitments precluded a thorough search of library collections.

A second notable limitation is that no criteria for judging the quality of research studies, for the purpose of including/excluding them from the review, were used. The various types of research and research-disciplines represented in the studies reviewed herein made it difficult to identify criteria that would apply appropriately and equitably to all studies. We did, though, make note of several studies for which replication appeared lacking, and a mention of that concern will be made at appropriate points in the review.

Related Research

The purpose of this section is to briefly highlight findings from related research that serves as relevant background to the main body of the literature review.

Pidgin/Creole Studies

Papers by Sato (1985) and Day (1983) traced the development and major factors (economic, demographic, social/cultural, political) affecting the evolution of "pidgin English" in Hawaii. Both papers provide essential background about the origins of "pidgin English" and the context of its development in Hawaii.

Sato (1985) explained that a pidgin is "developed by speakers of different languages for use among themselves" (p. 256). According to Day (1983), "If there is neither time or resources to learn the language of the host culture, a pidgin develops, which serves as a contact language, and is not usually the native language of any of its speakers" (p. 12).

By contrast, "A creole is a language spoken by the native-born children of pidgin-speaking parents. It functions as the mother tongue of its speakers" (Sato, 1985, p. 256). The creole language that developed in Hawaii is referred to by linguists as Hawaii Creole English (HCE). Sato further noted "It was not until the mid-1930s or so, when HCE usage was at its peak" (p. 261).

Ironically, it seems that school policy of the former Department of Public Instruction inadvertently contributed to the development of HCE. That is, the English Standard system which was in effect from 1924-1948 "helped maintain the distance between HCE speakers and English speakers for another twenty years" (Sato, p. 265).

Even as HCE usage reached its peak, a gradual process of decreolization, wherein "the creole slowly loses its distinctive features and takes on many of the features of the dominant... language" (Day, 1983, p. 20), became evident. This trend seems to have been accelerated by World War II and the following years during which contact with English speakers increased rapidly. However, as HCE tended to become more similar to English, not all segments of Hawaiian society appear to have been affected similarly. Some polarization along class/ethnic lines appears to have occurred since "as the middle class's identity with SE [standard English] developed, so the working class's alienation from it increased" (Sato, 1985, p. 266).

HCE, consequently, is not a singular, homogeneous language. Day (1983) writes that "in Hawaii today, there is a linguistic continuum, a number of varieties of HCE. There is no single speech code which we can identify and label HCE. There are two extremes to this linguistic continuum. At one end there is a type of HCE which strongly resembles the HCE spoken by plantation children in the early 1900's; the other end has something which resembles mainland English" (p. 20). The heterogeneous nature of HCE presents various difficulties for researchers (and others, e.g., policy-makers), the most obvious being simply that of describing and defining adequately what is meant by HCE or "pidgin English."

Second Language Acquisition Research

There are striking parallels between concerns about "pidgin English" in Hawaii and the controversy about bilingual education nationally. As noted in a recent review (Hakuta and Gould, 1987) of research on bilingual education, "Passions run high in the debate on bilingual education.... Until the terms of... [discussion] are clarified, the policy debate will continue to be dominated by political rhetoric and folk notions" (p. 39). Certainly there are numerous reasons contributing to this situation. An especially salient one is that language, in addition to cognitive skills, "also embodies social identity and is a marked characteristic of ethnicity" (ASCD, 1987, p. 9).

In the context of the present review, there are three main findings from the research on bilingual education that are particularly important.

(1) It is a misconception that instruction in a student's native language will retard acquisition of English. The Hakuta and Gould (1987) review, the ASCD (1987) report, as well as other research not cited herein, essentially make the same point: "the ability to transfer to English what is learned in the native language applies not only to content-area subjects like reading and math, but also to skills in reading and writing" (ASCD, p. 22). Hakuta and Gould strongly assert that "research overwhelmingly refutes the... argument... that the time spent in the classroom using the native language is wasted or lost" (p. 41).

(2) English language proficiency is context-dependent. That is, "children become conversationally fluent in English before they develop the ability to actually use English in academic situations" (Hakuta and Gould, 1987, p. 40). Further, Hakuta and Gould note that "while children may pick up oral proficiency in as little as two years, it may take five to seven years to acquire the 'decontextualized' language skills necessary to function successfully in an all-English classroom" (pp. 40-41).

(3) There is no clear research evidence about an "optimal" age for second-language acquisition nor much support for the notion that early is better. "Teenagers and adults are much more efficient learners than elementary school children, and fourth- to seventh-graders are faster than first- to third-graders.... It is important to realize that, especially for primary grade children, second-language learning is likely to be a very slow process" (Hakuta and Gould, 1987, p. 41).

Prior Interventions in Hawaii

Two studies were found, excluding those associated with the Kamehameha Early Education Program (which are included in the main body of the literature review), that dealt with language intervention programs directed at HCE-speakers. One of these programs, which seems to be commonly known as the "Keaukaha Project," operated in the late 1960's and was "a four-year program designed to develop and test a method for teaching standard English to non-standard dialect speakers in the first four grades" of Keaukaha Elementary School in Hilo, Hawaii (Petersen, Chuck and Coladarci, 1982, p. 1). The study used a treatment-control design wherein "the project used one classroom as an experimental class and one as a control class for each of the grades K through 3" (p. 2).

The intervention essentially consisted of an audio-lingual approach to English development adapted from English as a Second Language (ESL) methods developed for adults. Although not clearly described in the materials available to us, it appears that the intervention might be characterized today as a structure-based ESL approach. Characteristic of such an approach is drill-and-practice instruction focused on language form, with language use targeted at producing grammatically correct English.

Results of the study indicated that ratings of oral standard English proficiency improved significantly, particularly for boys (Petersen et al., 1972, p. 86). However, "transfer effects" to achievement in language arts,

reading readiness, and verbal scholastic ability (measured by the California Achievement Test, Metropolitan Readiness Test, and the California Test of Mental Maturity) were not found (Petersen et al., p. 87). Thus, the Keaukaha Project seems to have been successful only at modifying surface-level features of students' speech and had no impact on other standard English-related school achievement measures.

A second program is of special interest because it was the only Hawaii-specific HCE intervention found for adults. For at least twenty years before 1969, a program operated at the University of Hawaii which selected university students who had "a less than adequate command of a generally intelligible and acceptable form of spoken English" and remanded them to a sequence of speech courses until a course was passed (Board of Regents policy statement cited in Heinberg, 1979, p. 25). During 1965-69, the Speech-Communication Center program at the University of Hawaii was developed to more efficiently accomplish the same purpose. Adapting many of the elements from the prior system (e.g., ratings of a one-minute speech sample by a panel of three faculty members), between 1969-74 the program operated a University-wide screening (selection-exemption) process; provided training to identified students; and following satisfactory completion of the training, certified "that they had reached minimum level of language competence" (Heinberg, p. 25). Test development and research were also conducted under the auspices of the program.

Of particular interest here are results reported for groups of raters who participated in a reliability study during the development of an interview rating scale that was used by a three-member faculty panel in the selection process. The different groups of raters included "professors in the related areas of linguistics, English and ESL, high-level educational administrators, and corporation executives engaged in personnel employment and training. Correlations of these groups' ratings... with the speech-communication faculty members' ratings... ranged from .63 to .74" (Heinberg, pp. 25-26). Thus, a moderate level of convergence was obtained among various professional groups, including potential employers, in rating the language proficiency of university students. Heinberg (Note 3) has also stated that the only factor clearly associated with low ratings was ineffective communication on technical tasks, not "pidgin English" or standard English per se.

LITERATURE REVIEW FINDINGS

The review is organized by the following topics: (1) school language learning with subsections for studies related to (a) reading achievement and related measures, (b) oral story comprehension, and (c) standard English and HCE relationships; (2) classroom instruction, including studies of program interventions. Some studies, of course, do not fit neatly under a given heading or may be included in more than one area.

School Language Learning

1. Reading Achievement (and Related Measures)

The Standard English Repetition Test (SERT), a research instrument developed for use in The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP), was constructed "to measure the SE [standard English] performance of young children who speak HCE" (Day, Boggs, Speidel, Gallimore and Tharp, 1975, p. 2). The SERT is an individually administered test; an adult examiner instructs the child to repeat standard English sentences which the examiner says to the child. The repetition task "assumes that a child who understands a sentence, and/or who is familiar with its syntax, phonology, and vocabulary, will be more likely to repeat the sentence accurately than one who is not" (Day et al., p. 3).

Preliminary findings reported for 28 HCE speaking kindergarten children (who were predominantly of some Hawaiian ancestry, from mostly low socioeconomic familities, and attending the KEEP demonstration school) indicated moderate correlations between SERT scores and scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test: .62 and .69, for fall and spring test administrations, respectively (Day et al., 1975, p. 12). In addition, similar findings were obtained for relationships between the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI) and SERT for the Full Scale, Verbal, and Performance scales of the WPPSI. Correlations of SERT with the WPPSI Verbal scale, for example, were .53 in fall and .76 in spring of kindergarten.

Generally, these results are consistent with "the expectation that SE performance is a factor in school-related performance from the beginning" (Day et al., 1975, p. 12).

An analogue to the SERT, the Hawaii Creole English Repetition Test (HCERT) was also developed as a KEEP research instrument (Gallimore, Day and Tharp, 1978). Noteworthy is the following comment by Gallimore et al. (1978, p. 1): "Even though HCE is used throughout the Hawaiian Islands by persons of many social and economic levels, it is widely assumed to cause learning problems for many island children. However, there have been no empirical demonstrations that HCE usage by school children has academic consequences, positive or negative."

Correlations between HCERT performance and various school-related achievement/ability measures were reported by Gallimore et al. (1978) for samples of K-3 students attending the KEEP demonstration school. For kindergarteners (n = 77), small but statistically significant correlations of .37 and .42 between HCERT (exact HCE repetition) scores and Metropolitan Readiness Test scores were obtained for fall and spring test administrations. For children in grades 1-3 (n = 100, 70, 60, respectively) who had been given the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test in spring, correlations with HCERT scores ranged from .36 to .54 for the Vocabulary subtest and from .25 to .45 for the Comprehension subtest (Gallimore et al., p. 17). Thus, students who scored higher on the HCERT (i.e., were able to repeat verbatim, in HCE, features of sentences said by the examiner in HCE) tended to do <u>better</u> on reading achievement measures.

Speidel (1979) examined patterns of language development of HCE speaking children in KEEP classes at kindergarten (n = 27), first (n = 27), and third (n = 39) grades on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA). The ITPA comprises ten subtests and "assesses several different language skills, ranging from comprehension to vocabulary, to short-term memory, to different facets of oral production" (Speidel, 1981, p. 26). Primary findings were that the profiles of language development were uneven, that is, the "children score higher on tests using the visual channel and lower on several auditory tests" (Speidel, 1979, p. 1). However, the <u>overall</u> level of language

development of the students at each grade level was approximately average relative to test norms. Further, the profile patterns were found to be stable across grade levels: "Four years of schooling in which instruction is in standard English do not alter the pattern" (Speidel, p. 1).

Analysis of profiles by socioeconomic status found that "lower class children have a pattern of psycholinguistic skill virtually identical (but lower) to that of middle class children, suggesting the socioeconomic factors do not play a role in producing the skill pattern found" (Speidel, 1979, p. 10).

Particularly relevant are Speidel's (1979) findings regarding the ITPA's Grammatic Closure test, "which measures the automatic knowledge of standard English syntax and grammar by a cloze procedure" (p. 6). Students at all grades had the lowest level of performance on Grammatic Closure (between one and two standard deviations below their mean total performance level). Furthermore, it was observed that "The children of KEEP...tend to have great difficulty with this particular task and tend to complete the sentences using Hawaii English" (Speidel, 1981, p. 26).

Students in first and third grades were also given the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Achievement Test (Vocabulary and Comprehension subtests) as well as the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). Multiple regression analysis results indicated that the best predictor of reading scores, for both vocabulary and comprehension, was performance on the Grammatic Closure test of the ITPA, even with the WISC Verbal IQ measure included in the analysis (Speidel, 1979, pp. 7-8). Moderate and statistically significant correlations in the range .51 to .73 were found between Grammatic Closure and the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary and Comprehension scores. Furthermore, even with the effects of Verbal IQ statistically removed, significant partial correlations in the range .36 to .59 were obtained (Speidel, Table 3, p. 20).

Thus, for those children included in the study, students "who were most familiar with and showed the greatest facility in automatically generating standard English grammatical features had the highest reading achievement scores" (Speidel, 1979, p. 10). The findings strongly suggest that familiarity

with standard English and possibly home-school language differences, rather than socioeconomic factors or intellectual ability per se, may be more closely related to students' reading performance.

Considering the research summarized to this point, it seems an appropriate place to note that the issue of HCE-school achievement relationships is often commonly framed in terms of the notion that HCE interferes with school learning. As Speidel (1981) pointed out: "This formulation, however, does not provide the appropriate focus for the problem. The inquiry should be reworded to ask whether unfamiliarity with the standard language, or with the language spoken at school, results in reading or other school difficulties" (p. 23).

2. Oral Story Comprehension

Prior Hawaii-specific research in this area was summarized in a paper by Speidel, Tharp, and Kobayashi (1985). What makes this study of special interest is that it investigated the comprehension of extended discourse (stories), not single sentences. As indicated by Speidel et al. (1985), prior research appeared to conclude that nonstandard-English speakers had no difficulty in understanding the standard language; however, that research was based on tasks involving the comprehension of single sentences.

The questions addressed by the study were: (1) Do HCE-speaking children have the same ability to understand connected discourse as their SE-speaking peers? (2) Do HCE-speaking children have more difficulty understanding SE discourse than HCE discourse? (3) Can children's comprehension of SE discourse be made easier by making certain modifications? (Speidel et al., 1985, p. 85).

Included in the study were 120 grade 2 students (60 HCE speakers, 60 SE speakers; equal numbers of boys and girls) who were enrolled in Hawaii public schools. The experimental study was based on a 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 factorial design. The first factor was language background of the students (HCE or SE). The second factor was language code of the stories read aloud to the

students: SE, SE with HCE pronunciation, or HCE. The third factor was syntactic complexity of the discourse: simple or complex syntax versions of the story. The fourth factor was students' gender. Each child participated in one of the six listening conditions and was orally tested on three pre-recorded listening selections.

Results of the study "clearly indicate that the present sample of Hawaiian-English children had no problems in understanding discourse selections as such: they correctly answered as many questions on the Hawaiian-English versions as the standard English children did on the standard versions.... Nevertheless, those Hawaiian children who heard the selections in their own dialect understood more than those who heard them in standard English" (Speidel et al., 1985, p. 90).

Considering the experimental design used, which ought to have controlled for extraneous differences between SE and HCE conditions (e.g., unfamiliarity with task demands, selection content, types of questions, or manner in which language was used), the results "indicate clearly that with Hawaiian children, the linguistic differences between their dialect and standard English result in comprehension difficulties" (Speidel et al., 1985, p. 91).

Regarding modifications of discourse to make it more comprehensible (via simplified syntax or HCE pronunciation), results were surprising. First, "the Hawaii-English group did not perform better on the syntactically simpler standard versions" (Speidel et al., 1985, p. 92). Second, giving HCE pronunciation to selections in standard English did not help comprehension and, in fact, the Hawaiian children's performance was lower in this language code condition (but not significantly so) than was their performance on the standard English version (Speidel et al., p. 88).

It would seem to require no argument that comprehension of extended/connected discourse is critical for classroom learning. Findings of this study suggest that HCE speakers may "have some difficulty understanding the numerous language events in a classroom in which standard

English is the language of instruction" (Speidel et al., 1985, p. 91). Teachers, then, should be aware that children may have difficulty understanding some of the classroom instruction. Teachers should frequently check the children's comprehension and may need to explain things in several different ways, using perhaps diagrams and pictures, or demonstrations. For early elementary grades, teachers may need to occasionally use HCE with HCE speaking children (as instruction in a child's native language is used in bilingual education programs) so that meaningful, comprehensible communication and opportunities for extended discourse occur.

3. Standard English and HCE Relationships

Much of the Hawaii-specific linguistic research has been done at KEEP. It will be seen that HCE-related findings are strikingly similar to those from national research on second language acquisition.

Day (1979) investigated the hypothesis that HCE speaking children acquire standard English without a formal standard English program in school, and further, that as children acquire SE they also maintain fluency in HCE. The study included 98 HCE speaking students in the KEEP demonstration school in grades K-3. Students' performance in SE was measured with the SERT; performance in HCE was measured with the HCERT. All students were tested twice: for kindergarteners and second graders, the tests were administered eight months apart, and for first and third graders, the tests were administered 20 months apart.

For the SERT and HCERT, results showed that students' scores increased significantly from pre- to posttesting in nearly all grade-level groups (except for grade 2 on the HCERT). "The analysis of the SERT and HCERT data supports the hypothesis that the acquisition of a standard language would not adversely affect a child's first... language" (Day, 1979, p. 298).

Significant correlations in the range .47 to .81 (with a median value of approximately .56) were obtained between SERT and HCERT scores within grade-level groups (see Table 4 of Day, 1979, p. 300). Thus, students who

performed well on the SE repetition test also tended to do well on the HCE repetition test. Day (1979) concluded, in part, that: "Children in a speech community where the vernacular is of low prestige (or nonmainstream) apparently can acquire the standard code (or mainstream dialect) and still maintain their first" (p. 301).

One of the few non-KEEP research papers in this area obtained very similar findings for a sample of 96 high school students from a rural area on the island of Hawaii. Feldman, Stone, Wertsch and Strizich (1977) tested the "trade-off assumption" which essentially posits that "anyone who uses a nonstandard variety of English at home or with his peer group is going to be less capable of communicating in Standard English than if he used only Standard English" (Feldman et al., pp. 41-42).

Using repetition tests similar to the SERT and HCERT, a correlation of .68 between the SE and HCE measures was obtained. Further, Feldman et al. (1977) noted that: "If subjects are indeed deficient in one dialect as a function of their proficiency in the other, then one should find that the majority of subjects are above the median on one test and below the median on the other. In fact, fully two-thirds of the subjects are either above or below the median on both tests, i.e., subjects are either masters of both dialects or masters of neither" (p. 46).

Related analyses pointed to the same conclusion: "We have no evidence to support the trade-off hypothesis in our sample" (Feldman et al., 1977, p. 47). The researchers speculated that "Since some sort of general language ability seems to underlie performance in both dialects, we would suggest that it is the task of education to make use of this ability" (Feldman et al., p. 48).

A report by Gallimore and Tharp (1976) provides a convenient summary of linguistic research conducted at KEEP during the period 1971-76. Since some of the KEEP findings have already been introduced above, what follows is limited to additional findings particularly relevant to this review.

In a longitudinal study from kindergarten to grade two, KEEP students tested with the SERT "first become better at doing the task ... and then begin to give exact SE responses rather than HCE transforms" (Gallimore and Tharp, 1976, p. 12). By the end of grade two, 64% of students' responses to the SERT were exact SE repetitions and 15% were HCE transforms of SE features (see Table 3 of Gallimore and Tharp, p. 13). Corresponding figures from the fall of kindergarten were only 32% for exact SE and 35% for HCE transformations. Thus, the findings imply that the HCE-speaking "children are becoming more proficient in SE" (p. 12) and that they initially "comprehend SE better than they can speak it" (p. 17). Important to note is that there was no formal instructional intervention in effect directed at standard English language per se.

Of interest is a summary of a KEEP experiment that attempted to train students in the use of a specific SE feature, rules for plurals formation of singular words. While the specific results of this study were not clear (cf., Gallimore and Tharp, 1976, p. 44), some valuable practical knowledge was gained (p. 46):

> Whatever else was learned from the plurality training experiment, it was clear that the instructional approach used offered little hope . . . if every SE feature took three or more weeks to learn, the cost would be enormous. In addition, there are many who argue that the training approach used was unnatural, and language fluency rules learned in a formal setting rarely generalize.

In summary, research in this area indicates that (1) students who perform well in HCE also tend to perform well in SE; (2) young children's oral communication, whether in SE or HCE, improves through time without formal, direct instruction; and (3) instructional interventions attempting to train students to use specific micro-SE features are not likely practical nor effective.

Classroom Instruction

Research on instructional interventions, focused on reading and language development among HCE-speaking children, are limited mostly to work done by researchers at KEEP. From 1974 to the present, KEEP reading approaches have been of two main types. These two types could be characterized as (1) phonics-based and (2) comprehension-oriented approaches. In recent years, a "natural context" approach that combines reading instruction (comprehension-oriented) with oral language development has been a primary topic of study.

Tharp (1981) summarized changes that occurred in KEEP reading instruction from the phonics program to the comprehension program. Tharp noted that the teaching of decoding the sound-symbol relationships of text (phonics) and the comprehension of extended text are usually confounded with teaching styles, (i.e., direct instruction vs. informal teaching). Direct instruction of phonics or the informal teaching of comprehension are the two dominant patterns of reading instruction. Consequently, "an unwarranted assumption has also been growing: that decoding programs are superior to comprehension programs. It may be that direct instruction, when joined to a comprehension focus, would be equal to or even superior to a decoding, phonics-based program" (Tharp, p. 6).

Evaluation findings (Klein, 1981) seem to clearly show the superior performance of KEEP elementary students (grades 1-3) in the comprehension program compared to the phonics program. Similar findings were reported for comparisons of the KEEP comprehension program with control/comparison conditions at public school "export" sites as well (Klein, p. 9). Tharp (1981) concluded that even though "direct instruction has been a feature of the KEEP program from the very first, the original decoding orientation was unsuccessful and was replaced with a much more successful comprehension orientation" (p. 6).

It ought to be borne in mind, however, that differences between the reading approaches were relative, not absolute. For example, although the phonics program was phased-out by 1977, that does not mean that all teaching of phonics was subsequently eliminated; rather, the amount of instructional time spent on phonics was considerably reduced (Tharp, 1981, p. 7).

According to Tharp (1981) two major changes characterize the comprehension program. First, "two-thirds of face-to-face instructional time is allocated to comprehension and one-third to decoding" (p. 6), and during seatwork "about one-half is on comprehension objectives" (pp. 6-7). The second change noted by Tharp (1981) was a move to small-group classroom organization: "With comprehension-orientation, discussion and participation are appropriate methods, making small-group teacher-led instruction the method of choice" (p. 7). In other research reviewed below, it will be seen that the small-group organization has some features compatible with certain characteristics of the contemporary Hawaiian culture (socialization experience) of disadvantaged part-Hawaiian children. [See Au, 1981, for a more detailed description of the KEEP comprehension-oriented reading lessons.]

Speidel (1981) noted that the comprehension reading lessons "possess many of the features we have found to be effective in our research on instructional procedures for developing oral language skills," and summarized preliminary research indicating "that children in the comprehension-oriented reading program developed greater proficiency in English compared to children in the phonics program" (p. 29). From the perspectives of early language learning in the home and cultural compatibility, the KEEP comprehension-oriented reading program can be characterized as using a "natural context" method. Speidel (1982) hypothesized that the approach was effective because "it combines features that characterize the language environment of children learning their first language ... with features that are compatible with the way in which Hawaiian children learn" (p. 52). What are these features? How are these features different from those of the typical classroom?

Jordan (1982) summarized findings from ethnographic work on contemporary Hawaiian culture and noted that in Hawaiian families "siblings and other children are very important in the socialization process; it is in or from the sibling or companion group that a great deal of children's at-home learning takes place" (p. 18). Also, while children listen to adults in talk-story settings, the "children are exposed to a rich diet of adult speech and also to the particular socio-linguist patterns of talk-story events" (Jordan, p. 20).

A maternal teaching modes study conducted by Jordan (1982) investigated task-oriented teaching communication between mother-child pairs. Pairs were selected from a group of Hawaiian kindergarten children and their mothers and contrasted with pairs from a middle-class mainland population. In brief, results suggested that "the Hawaiian children are socialized at home to communicate and learn in ways that differ from the communication and learning ... [modes] of mainstream culture children" (Jordan, p. 22). Hawaiian mothers, for example, were found to use lower rates of verbal controlling techniques but higher rates of co-participation (modelling, demonstration, or physical intervention in combination with verbal directions) than were mainland mothers.

Jordan (1982) also reported that Hawaiian children strongly attend to peers rather than adults. "They spend a high proportion of their classroom time in peer interaction. This can be disastrous, or it can present no problems, depending on how it is handled by the teacher" (p. 22). In the typical classroom, most instructional activity is teacher-directed and students are usually expected to work independently of one anther. By contrast, Jordan (1982) noted that "If Hawaiian children are isolated from each other and not allowed to have the social interaction with peers that is so important to them, they spend a great deal of time establishing illicit peer contacts" (p. 29).

Although much of the research on the KEEP comprehension-oriented reading program has focused on the teacher-led small group reading lesson, Jordan (1982) pointed out that KEEP students spend about 80% of their language arts time in teacher-independent centers. The teacher-independent center organization is one of the culturally compatible elements of the reading program for "it allows children the company of other children in adult-approved circumstances . . ." and the setting "is congruent with familiar sibling and companion group contexts for <u>working</u>" (Jordan, p. 24).

Another culturally compatible instructional strategy, which occurs in the context of teacher-directed question-and-answer routines, is avoidance of the "shut down" (Jordan, 1982) response. Diagnostic questioning routines are common in typical classrooms; however, in an ethnographic study of a first grade public school classroom, Boggs (1985) found that "the response to the

teacher's persistent attempts to make the children answer questions individually and only when called upon had the effect of turning recitations into struggles for control of the classroom" (p. 134). Teacher questioning of individual children who had not volunteered a response tended to result in the Hawaiian child's ceasing to interact with the teacher. Furthermore, such questioning apparently invoked a "defensive maneuver" such that "several children talking at once shifted the dyadic relationship to one in which the teacher was forced to treat the entire class as a whole" (Boggs, p. 134). Boggs (1985) noted also that in low-income Hawaiian homes direct questioning is usually used by adults to scold a child and obtain an admission of wrongdoing prior to punishment. KEEP teachers, then, avoid direct questioning as that "allows children to remain actively participating in teacher-led activities" (Jordan, p. 28).

Speidel (1982) suggested that "the typical traditional school interaction with its high frequency of diagnostic questioning routines would not be one to encourage language development in Hawaiian children..." and that the relatively slower rate of Hawaiian children's acquisition of some standard English features "could be partially a function of the mismatch between ways of attending and responding to language events at home and at school" (p. 48). In a series of related papers, Speidel (1982), Dowhower-Vuyk and Speidel (1982), and Vogt (1982), respectively, summarized: (1) many features of the natural context approach that are similar to features of Hawaiian children's first language (HCE) acquisition; (2) instructional processes and strategies for language learning through meaningful discussion/conversation; and (3) a framework for integrating oral language development and reading into a sequence of comprehension-oriented teaching strategies.

Speidel (1987a) contrasted KEEP kindergarteners' progress using the natural context approach and a "pattern repetition" (Peabody Language Development Kit lessons) approach. Each treatment group was accompanied by a control condition and the implementation of all conditions was thoroughly monitored. On four of six measures (Information, Vocabulary, Similarities, and Verbal Expression), children participating in the natural context approach had significantly higher scores than did students in the control group; and on

one measure (Comprehension), children in the natural context condition out-performed those in the control group but the difference was not statistically significant (Speidel, pp. 11-12). On the sixth task (Grammatic Closure) there was no between-groups difference.

By contrast, results comparing the performance of students in the pattern repetition approach to those in a control group found that the pattern repetition approach "had virtually no effect on stimulating any of the skills measured" (Speidel, 1987a, p. 12). Speidel (p. 17) concluded that:

> In sum, observations of the instructional and learning processes during actual instruction suggest that these two approaches to learning activate different language learning processes. The natural context approach activates a semantically guided thinking process which has as its goal the mapping of external situations to language, and mapping thought to language. The pattern repetition approach... more likely activates a rote learning process that results in isolated learning with little functional utility.

Speidel (1987b) further analyzed the natural context approach in KEEP reading lessons to investigate how "message oriented" conversation between a teacher and a small group of students might contribute to the learning of grammar and vocabulary. In message oriented talk, "the focus is on understanding the messages of others and on putting one's thoughts into words" (Speidel, p. 99). First language learning typically occurs by means of message oriented talk. By contrast, medium oriented talk, which is typical of formal second language instruction, emphasizes learning structural features of the target language (e.g., grammatical rules, vocabulary).

Speidel (1987b) studied message oriented talk among six first-grade KEEP children and a teacher in their 20-minute reading lesson. Primary findings were that the reading lessons were characterized by a conversational style; students made use of the teacher's and peers' linguistic input (lexical, grammatical, and syntactic information) in their speech; and relative to students in a comparison group, students who participated in the

conversational approach showed greater improvement on two measures of standard English grammar. Although not a true experiment, the "findings suggest that the students extended their grammatical skills by participating in meaningful conversations with their teacher and a small group of peers. They did not require systematic instruction in the rules of grammar or drilling difficult grammatical patterns" (Speidel, p. 129).

An ethnographic study by Boggs (1985) is of particular interest in that it describes, in a public school classroom of 27 first grade students, "the lack of fit between routines and participation structures learned at home and those encountered in school" (p. 120). Students in the class were predominantly part-Hawaiian children from low-income families. One result of the lack of fit described by Boggs (1985) is the "struggle for control" of classroom activities between students and teacher. Boggs (1985) described the situation as follows (pp. 120-121):

> Teachers typically insist upon supervising and directing activities in detail, while the children are accustomed to occupying themselves, initiating and carrying out tasks without attracting adult attention. The more the teacher attempts to gain their attention and control their activities, the harder they try to avoid her. In the resulting confusion, directives by the teacher occupy an inordinate amount of instructional time, so the children receive relatively little direct and meaningful instruction. Attempts at recitation become instead a stream of directives . . .

Boggs (1985) characterized the reading instruction in the class as "ineffectual" (p. 121). Although the on-going struggle for control and lack of time on task likely contribute, Boggs (1985) also found that the reading lessons were <u>decontextualized</u>, and noted in that regard a mismatch between home and school task participation settings. That is, at home children's attention to and involvement in a task are obtained in response to an already occurring activity, whereas at school children are expected to attend to the teacher before tasks are initiated and upon her demand (Boggs, p. 129). During reading lessons, then, the social context for children's initial learning

or for later transfer and elicitation of what had been learned were inappropriate "since the children were supposed to do the exercises alone, and to transfer what they learned alone" (Boggs, p. 135).

Boggs (1985) provided some evidence that appropriate social contexts sometimes occurred in the classroom and that "striking instances of past learning were then demonstrated" (p. 136). An example relevant to this review was an observation (Boggs, p. 136) of one child, an HCE speaker, correcting another's use of an HCE phoneme in a word. In this example, an appropriate social context was present, in part, because "children commonly correct one another's speech" (Boggs, p. 136).

Only one study was found that investigated attitudes of young children toward HCE and SE. Day (1980) studied linguistic attitudes among 87 kindergarten and first grade students drawn from two schools in urban Honolulu. One school was located in a low-income neighborhood and the other school was located in a high-income neighborhood. Day (1980) sought to determine "if kindergarten and first grade children born and raised in Hawaii would express preferences and value judgements about speakers of HCE and SE which are consistent with those in the speech community" (p. 28).

In brief, Day (1980) found that "grade in school is more important in determining linguistic preference than is the location of the school" (p. 31). Furthermore, results indicated that the children, except for kindergarteners from the school in the low-income neighborhood, seemed to prefer SE speech. For children from the low-income neighborhood, Day (1980) suggested that "young HCE-speaking children come to school unaware of the speech community norms toward HCE and SE" (p. 31) but that by first grade they apparently internalize community norms as indicated by the switch in their preference from HCE to SE speech. Although in need of replication and further research, Day's (1980) study raises the unsettling prospect that discrepancies between a child's preference for SE and performance in SE might also contribute to difficulties in developing proficiency in standard English.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Before drawing any conclusions from the research findings reviewed, certain limitations and constraints must be kept in mind. First, students included in the studies reviewed were predominantly (a) young early primary school-age children (b) who were mostly HCE speakers (c) of part-Hawaiian ethnic background (d) from low socioeconomic households (e) located in communities where social identity has strong roots in contemporary Hawaiian culture and (f) were attending a special Kamehameha Schools research/demonstration school. These characteristics of the children seem sufficiently different from those of the general population that one must be careful about generalizing the findings to other, dissimilar groups of children.

Second, the reader should be careful not to interpret comparisons of HCE and SE as a literal dichotomy. The notion "HCE vs. SE" is little more than a convenient shorthand to aid discussion. Considering the linguistic origins of HCE, it is obvious that HCE and SE speech codes share many features in common and are not mutually exclusive. There are varieties of HCE as there are of SE and these HCE and SE varieties together form a linguistic continuum. Thus, it would be inaccurate to interpret "HCE vs. SE" as a comparison between two discrete and well-defined points on a linguistic continuum. Definitions of HCE and SE in the research reviewed, consequently, are often general and lack the specificity required of operationally defined terms.

Third, one ought not assume that relationships of HCE or SE with school achievement variables are necessarily cause-effect relationships. The naturally occurring confounding of other variables (e.g, socioeconomic status, ethnic background, acculturation/socialization experiences) with children's HCE/SE speech codes, makes it extremely difficult (if not impossible) for researchers to disentangle the effects of one variable from another.

Given these cautions, what can be concluded about relationships between HCE, SE, and school achievement? What are the implications for educational policy and for instructional practice in Hawaii's public schools?

(1) Young children's oral communication, whether in SE or HCE, improves through time. Such improvement occurs without formal, direct instruction. However, among young HCE speakers from low socioeconomic households, the natural rate of SE acquisition is slow and the level of SE language development lags behind that of children whose first language is SE.

(2) Children's performance in HCE and SE are moderately and positively correlated. There is no empirical support for the "trade-off" notion that children who speak HCE will be less proficient in SE than had they not learned HCE at all. To the contrary, the research indicates facility in HCE and SE go together: generally, children either communicate well in both HCE and SE or do not communicate well in either.

(3) Among young HCE speakers, the oral language interventions of the drill-and-practice skills type that target specific SE speech features have met with very limited success. Such approaches do not appear to generalize to students' use of language in other areas, i.e., reading, and there is some doubt that children's use of formally learned rules for SE speech transfers to non-school settings. Moreover, instructional interventions that would train students to use specific micro-SE features (e.g., plurals formation) are not feasible given the time and cost requirements of such direct teaching of large numbers of micro-SE features.

(4) Young HCE speaking children have somewhat more difficulty understanding extended discourse (e.g., when told stories) in SE than in HCE. Simplifying SE discourse by using non-complex syntax or using an HCE pronunciation does not seem to help comprehension. HCE-speaking children found such modified discourse to be more difficult than unaltered SE. SE-speaking children, similarly, have somewhat more difficulty understanding extended discourse in HCE than in SE.

(5) HCE speaking children's reading performance is at least moderately related to their familiarity with SE. Children who rapidly and automatically produce SE grammar and syntax, for example, tend to be better readers than are children who are less orally proficient or less familiar with SE.

Performance in HCE, in contrast to SE, is not as strongly related to success in reading. Nonetheless, the research generally indicates that the higher the children's HCE performance, the higher their reading achievement.

(6) Phonics-based reading programs have been largely unsuccessful with young HCE-speaking children. A comprehension-oriented reading program developed at KEEP that uses direct teaching of comprehension seems more successful with HCE-speaking children. In addition to emphasizing the direct instruction of comprehension, a number of elements of the KEEP reading program are considered more culturally compatible with some features of the Hawaiian child's early home-community socialization than the traditional forms of reading instruction. Co-narration and peer assistance with work are examples of features of the KEEP reading program compatible with the Hawaiian child's home culture.

(7) For young children from families of low socioeconomic status socialized in contemporary Hawaiian culture, there are marked cultural mismatches between home and school that likely contribute to students' lack of success in regular classrooms. Examples of cultural mismatch include miscommunication about discipline related to the teacher's use of diagnostic questioning routines, and failure to establish a socially relevant context for learning. A teacher's expectations that children will attend to instructions upon demand and work individually under close supervision following detailed directives serve to establish a non-productive, decontextualized social setting without the familiar cues and peer structure needed to define and maintain the child's work on learning tasks. Particularly notable is that findings about such home-school cultural mismatches cut across subject matter areas and co-occur with but are not due to children's HCE use per se.

(8) Language, whether HCE or SE, is more than a means of communication. Language also embodies a person's social identity and functions as a marker of group/subculture affiliation. Among HCE speakers, HCE likely symbolizes "localism" and serves to maintain group cohesiveness. A study of linguistic attitudes seems to indicate that by first grade HCE-speaking children from low socioeconomic households adopt community speech norms and would like to listen to SE more than HCE speech.

One cannot, however, proceed directly from research findings to policy or practice. The link between research findings and policy decisions must be some conception or model of the learner. The internationally known child psychologist and educator Jerome Bruner (1985) has pointed out the "impossibility of ever settling institutional questions of education without first making a decision ... on the nature of learning and learners.... At the heart of the decision process there must be a value judgement about how the mind should be cultivated and to what end" (p. 5).

This is not to say that all models of learning or the learner are equally valid. Rather, the central point is that models of the learner depend upon research findings and value judgements.

Undoubtedly it is desirable for all of Hawaii's public school students to become fluent, self-confident SE speakers and literate in reading and writing in SE. How best to work toward these ends is less clear. Among HCE speakers in particular, should HCE be used in the classroom, and if so, how should it be used to further students' SE language development?

There seems to be an essentially simple and consistent pattern to the findings about HCE, SE, and school achievement summarized above. Assume a straightforward model of the learner posited by Smith (1986): (1) children learn best that which makes sense to them (e.g., meaningful and useful language); (2) children learn language through using it; and (3) children learn the language of those people with whom they identify, i.e., of the kind of person they see themselves as being. Given this model, the preceding findings imply that some HCE-speaking children may make relatively poor progress in school because mastering the school's language and reading tasks is not meaningful or really comprehensible to them; language in school is not used for real purposes or in ways familiar to them; and they seldom have the opportunity to use language, particularly extended discourse or talk, in the classroom. Only in school, for example, do adults frequently ask children questions, usually questions requiring at most a word or short phrase in response, to which the adult already knows the answers.

Although there is little in the research reviewed to suggest detailed "best" methods for developing SE among HCE speakers, limiting or prohibiting use of HCE is not indicated. Rather, the child's use of HCE could be used to bridge the gap between home and school. Given the model of the learner, this will only be successful if the school's use of SE is meaningful. To be "meaningful," teachers will need to select those instructional activities, materials, and strategies that are compatible with the children's understanding of relevant, comprehensible language and language uses.

If it is true that children learn what makes sense to them, then HCE-speaking children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds can become fluent SE speakers and literate in reading and writing SE. But the learning that is necessary to accomplish these goals must, fundamentally, make sense to the children. To further develop children's SE, there would need to be ample opportunity for children to use language (not just "study" it) and to talk in extended fashion about relevant matters. To extend HCE-speaking children's SE language experience would also mean acknowledging, understanding, and building upon their existing SE and HCE language background.

REFERENCES

ASCD Panel on Bilingual Education. Building An Indivisible Nation: Bilingual Education in Context. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1987.

Baird-Vogt, L. Comprehension teaching strategies to bridge the home and school language. Paper in "Oral language in a successful reading program for Hawaiian children" (Tech. Rep. No. 105). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1982.

Boggs, S.T. Speaking, Relating, and Learning: A Study of Hawaiian Children at Home and at School. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1985.

Bruner, J. Models of the learner. Educational Researcher, 1985, 14, 5-8.

Day, R.R. The acquisition and maintenance of language by minority children. Language Learning, 1979, 29, 295-303.

Day, R.R. The development of linguistic attitudes and preferences. TESOL Quarterly, 1980, 14, 27-37.

Day, R.R. Pidgin English: Hawaii's unique resource. In M.A. Clarke and J. Handscombe (eds.) On TESOL '82. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1983.

Day, R.R., Boggs, S.T., Speidel, G.E., Gallimore, R., and Tharp, R.G. The standard English repetition test (SERT): A measure of standard English performance for Hawaii Creole English-speaking children (Tech. Rep. No. 15). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Dowhower-Vuyk, S. and Speidel, G.E. The process of language learning and reading instruction. Paper in "Oral language in a successful reading program for Hawaiian children" (Tech. Rep. No. 105). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1982.

Feldman, C.F., Stone, A., Wertsch, J.V., and Strizich, M. Standard and nonstandard dialect competencies of Hawaiian Creole English speakers. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11, 41-50.

Gallimore, R., Day, R.R., and Tharp, R.G. A test of performance in Hawaii Creole English: The Hawaii Creole English repetition test (Tech. Rep. No. 28). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1978.

Gallimore, R. and Tharp, R.G. Studies of standard English and Hawaiian Islands Creole English: KEEP linguistic research, 1971-1976 (Tech. Rep. No. 59). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1976.

Hakuta, K. and Gould, L.J. Synthesis of research on bilingual education. Educational Leadership, 1987, 44, 38-45.

Heinberg, P. Measurement of speech-communication proficiency. In W.S. MacDonald and G. Tanabe (eds.) Focus on Classroom Behavior. Springfield, IL: Chas. C. Thomas, 1979.

Jordan, C. Cultural differences in communication patterns: Classroom adaptations and translation strategies. Paper in "Oral language in a successful reading program for Hawaiian children" (Tech. Rep. No. 105). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1982.

Klein, T. Results of the reading program. Educational Perspectives, 1981, 20, 8-10.

Oshiro, S.S. Strong English skills open many job doors. The Honolulu Advertiser, September 29, 1987, pp. A-1; A-4.

Petersen, R.O., Chuck, H.C., and Coladarci, A.P. Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Primary School Children in Hilo, Hawaii (Vol. I). U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, October 1969. [Reprint May 1972, (TAC 72-4599) State of Hawaii, Department of Education, Hawaii District]

Reyes, D. Panel wants pidgin kept out of schools. The Honolulu Advertiser, September 2, 1987, pp. A-1; A-5.

Reyes, D. Board votes 7-4 to keep pidgin out of classroom . The Honolulu Advertiser, September 18, 1987, pp. A-1; A-4.

Sato, C.J. Linguistic inequality in Hawaii: The post-creole dilemma. In Wolfson and Manes (eds.) Language of Inequality. Berlin: Mouton, 1985.

Smith, F. Insult to Intelligence: The Bureaucratic Invasion of Our Classrooms. New York: Arbor House, 1986.

Speidel, G.E. Psycholinguistic abilities and reading achievement in children speaking nonstandard English (Tech. Rep. No. 91). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1979.

Speidel, G.E. Language and reading: Bridging the language difference for children who speak Hawaiian English. Educational Perspectives, 1981, 20, 23-30.

Speidel, G.E. Responding to language differences. Paper in "Oral language in a successful reading program for Hawaiian children" (Tech. Rep. No. 105). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1982.

Speidel, G.E. Language differences in the classroom: Two approaches to developing language skills in dialect speaking children. In E. Oksaar (ed.) Sociocultural Perspectives of Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Tubingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1987(a).

Speidel, G.E. Conversation and language learning in the classroom. In K.E. Nelson and A. van Kleeck (eds.) Children's Language (Vol. 6). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1987(b).

Speidel, G.E., Tharp, R.G., and Kobayashi, L. Is there a comprehension problem for children who speak nonstandard English? A study of children with Hawaiian-English backgrounds. Applied Psycholinguistics, 1985, 6, 83-96.

Tharp, R.G. The direct instruction of comprehension. Educational Perspectives, 1981, 20, 5-7.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. State of Hawaii, Board of Education. Minutes of Curriculum Committee Meeting, September 1, 1987.

2. State of Hawaii, Department of Education, Office of the Superintendent, Public Relations Branch. News Release, September 18, 1987.

3. Heinberg, P. Personal communication, August 27, 1987.

APPENDIX A

Adopted by Board of Education
September 17, 1987

POLICY

STANDARD ENGLISH AND ORAL COMMUNICATION

Oral communication is the most commonly used form of human interaction in personal or social situations and in the work place. Oral communication, specifically standard English, may be considered the most significant basic skill in our lifetime.

Toward this end:

- Students will be provided the opportunity to learn and develop facility in oral standard English as a matter of high basic skill priority.

- Staff will:

  1) provide comprehensive and effective instruction in the expression and reception of oral standard English;

  2) model the use of standard English in the classroom and school-related settings except when objectives relate to native Hawaiian or foreign language instruction and practice or other approved areas of instruction and activities; and

  3) encourage students to use and practice oral standard English.

APPENDIX B

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the following persons who contributed information and expertise to the literature review process. Their help in retrieving relevant research papers and providing leads to related research and researchers was invaluable. Of course, no endorsement on their part of the present report is implied.

Mr. Charles Bogue, Educational Specialist I, National Origin Desegregation
Languages Section, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Dr. Mary Brandt, Evaluation Specialist II
Evaluation Section, Office of the Superintendent, Department of Education

Dr. James Brough, Director
Center for Study of Early Education, Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate

Dr. Richard Day, Professor (and Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs) Department of English as a Second Language, College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Dr. Michael Forman, Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics, College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Ms. Diane Gibbons (and Ms. Gail Shima), State Office Teacher
Hawaii Educational Dissemination Diffusion System (HEDDS), Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Dr. Robert Heath, Psychologist
Center for Development of Early Education, Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate

Dr. Paul Heinberg, Professor
Department of Communication, College of Social Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Ms. Nancy Hiu, Educational Specialist III (retired)
Languages Section, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Dr. Morris Lai, Educational Researcher
Curriculum Research and Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Ms. Roberta Mayor, Educational Specialist III
Languages Section, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Dr. Belen Ongteco, Educational Specialist II, Bilingual/Multicultural Projects
Languages Section, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Ms. Josephine Pablo, Educational Specialist II, Bilingual Education
Languages Section, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Dr. Theodore Rodgers, Professor
Curriculum Research and Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Dr. Charlene Sato, Assistant Professor
Department of English as a Second Language, College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Dr. Gisela Speidel, Psychologist
Center for Development of Early Education, Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate

Ms. Ethel Ward, Educational Specialist II, Program for SLEP
Languages Section, Office of Instructional Services, Department of Education

Dr. Karen Watson-Gegeo, Associate Professor
Department of English as a Second Language, College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii at Manoa